

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-6, 8, 11-13, 15-20, and 23-25 are pending in this application. Claims 2, 3, 7, 9, 10, 14, 21, 22, and 26 are withdrawn from further consideration. Claims 1, 8, and 17 are amended.

The Examiner objected to the disclosure because of informalities on pages 9 and 23 of the specification. Applicants have amended the specification to correct these informalities.

Claims 1, 6, 17, 18, 20, and 25 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Wassermann (U.S. Patent No. 3,259,288). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended claim 1 recites: “a pair of rollers provided at a location downstream of said image forming device to feed the continuous paper sheet so that a feeding speed of the pair of rollers is slightly higher than that of the tractor.” Support for applicants’ amendment is found in the specification (see Applicants’ specification, page 5). Claim 1 recites setting the feeding speed of the feeding device downstream from the photosensitive drum higher than the rotating speed of the tractor. Thus, different parts move at different speeds in claim 1. Wassermann, in contrast, fails to disclose this. Wassermann does not disclose being configured for variation in the rotational speed of different printer parts. Instead, in Wassermann the motor controls the tensioning in the paper via a vacuum chamber (see Wassermann, column 2, lines 44-45). The speeds of the drum 13 and the rollers 15 and 16 disclosed in Fig. 1 of Wassermann may increase or decrease, but they do so in concert (see Wassermann, column 3, lines 26-36). What Wassermann actually discloses is that the speed of a print job may not be the same as that of another print job. For instance, two print jobs may be contrasted because they involve “paper of various widths” or “paper of various thickness” (see Wassermann, column 1, lines 31 and 32). In addition, Wassermann discloses “high speed printing” (see Wassermann, column 3, line 37). In this context, high-speed printing means that an adjustable motor drive can simultaneously and uniformly adjust the speeds of the printer’s parts (see Wassermann, column 3, lines 26-36). However, applicants’ claim 1 is drafted so that the feeding speed of the downstream rollers as

claimed is slightly higher than the speed of the tractor. The difference in speed between the tractor and rollers facilitates high-precision feeding in the claimed invention. Moreover, the speed differential maintains good tension in the feeding paper, thereby avoiding hole breakage.

In addition, amended claim 1 recites: “when a continuous paper sheet feeding force is destabilized, the controller adjusts the braking force to compensate for the instability so that the tension applied to the continuous paper sheet is made constant.” The Examiner asserts that the braking force setting device is the same as the movable tap in Wassermann. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner.

The movable tap in Wassermann is a part of the variable auto-transformer, which in turn, controls the speed of the motor. Applicants’ braking force is adjustable even when the paper feeding force is unstable (see Applicants’ specification, pages 18 and 19). This type of adjustability maintains precise positioning during printing. Wassermann does not disclose the same feature. In other words, Wassermann does not disclose adjusting the braking force of the movable tap when the feeding force is unstable, such that the tension applied to the printing paper sheet is constant and feeding is subsequently stabilized. Thus, Wassermann does not anticipate claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is allowable. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection under 35 USC 102(b).

Claims 8 and 17 recite substantially similar subject matter as claim 1 and are patentable for at least the foregoing reasons. Since claims 4-6, 11-13, 15, 16, 18-20, and 23-25, depend from allowable claims 1, 8, and 17, those claims are allowable at least due to their respective dependencies. In view of the allowable nature of claims 4 and 23, due to their respective dependencies from claims 1 and 17, the Examiner’s rejection of those claims under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Wassermann in view of Nishimura (U.S. Patent No. 5,018,888) is moot.

In view of the above, each of the claims in this application is in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, applicants solicit early action in the form of a Notice of Allowance.

In the event that the transmittal letter is separated from this document and the Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicants petition for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing Docket No. 325772024500.

Dated: June 7, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By Barry E. Bretschneider 31,942
Barry E. Bretschneider
Registration No. 28,055

Morrison & Foerster LLP
1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 400
McLean, Virginia 22102
Telephone: (703) 760-7743
Facsimile: (703) 760-7777